

Remarks

Examiner has made a restriction requirement for the present application.

Applicants elect group I with traverse.

Claims 38-45, and 52-53 are withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In order to properly make a restriction requirement, the Examiner *must* show that the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed; and that there “would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required.” MPEP 803. Applicants agree with Examiner that the claimed surfactants are patentably distinct. However, Applicants do not believe that examining both inventions would present a serious burden.

The composition used in the method of group II is the same as that of group I. If a search turns up no relevant prior art for group I, then group II will necessarily be novel and non-obvious, and no further searching would be required. Thus, both inventions might be allowable with one search. If the search turns up relevant prior art, then the restriction could be revisited.

Please charge Deposit Account 01-0885 for any fees related to this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 23, 2006

**/Brent A. Johnson/
Brent A. Johnson
Registration No. 51,851
Agent of Record
Telephone: 714/246-4348
Facsimile: 714/246-4249**

**Please send all inquires to:
Brent A. Johnson (T2-7H)
Allergan, Inc.
2525 Dupont Drive
Irvine, CA 92612**